



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

fact that ' is the rough breathing in Greek is no sufficient reason for a change that is certain to confuse beginners. It is also a pity that *ch* is used for ך in Hebrew while *h* and *h* are used for Arabic ح and ح. Only in German does *ch* approximate the sound of ך. It is hard to see any reason why the meaning of the Arabic words should be given in Latin. In these degenerate days of classical studies there are probably many who undertake the study of Hebrew who have a very imperfect knowledge of Latin; and even when one is fairly well versed, one is likely to be puzzled by a rare word. What is the use of compelling a student to have a Latin dictionary at hand in order to use a Hebrew one? Latin is far less adapted for the exact translation of Arabic than is any modern language. It is easy to take the Latin meanings directly from Freytag, but in most cases they are less precise than the definitions that might be given in German.

Taken as a whole this dictionary is a welcome contribution to Hebrew lexicography. It is the best brief work in existence. American students who read German will find it a convenient manual at a reasonable price. Those who cannot afford to buy the large Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew Lexicon will find in this an excellent substitute; and even those who own the large lexicon will obtain from it much additional information.

LEWIS BAYLES PATON

HARTFORD THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
HARTFORD, CONN.

SANDERS' EDITION OF THE FREER MANUSCRIPTS

An intelligent purchase by Mr. Charles L. Freer in the winter of 1906 secured for this country one of the greatest of biblical manuscripts, or rather series of manuscripts, now extant. With wise and unstinted liberality Mr. Freer has decided to donate these manuscripts with other archaeological treasures in his possession to the Smithsonian Institution at Washington, D.C., and so to the American people. Meanwhile his generous purse is financing the publication of the manuscripts in a splendid facsimile edition, the first volume of which appeared now some four months ago.¹ The preparation of the edition is entrusted to Mr. Henry A. Sanders, professor of Latin in the University of Michi-

¹ *Facsimile of the Washington Manuscript of Deuteronomy and Joshua in the Freer Collection.* With an Introduction by Henry A. Sanders. Ann Arbor, Michigan: The University of Michigan, 1910.

gan. Professor Sanders has chosen to cut the introduction to the facsimile very short, indeed, publishing most of the information, which might be looked for there, together with other material, in an extended monograph.²

Mr. Sanders' work shows the marks of much diligent and painstaking labor. That along with much that is fresh and ingenious, faults and errors are also to be found will be the less surprising, when we remember that this is the author's first incursion into the field of biblical text-criticism. A very sane and well-balanced *critique* of this work, which will be easily accessible to most of the readers of this journal, is given by Dr. E. J. Goodspeed, under the caption "Exploration and Discovery" in the September issue of the *Biblical World*. Little need be added in praise or blame to what was said there.

In the facsimile volume, aside from the absence of the notation of contents on each page, noted by Professor Goodspeed, one is somewhat surprised to find our time-honored biblical verses hidden in the table of contents under the name of "paragraphs." One is distinctly disappointed, also, in finding that the introduction to the magnificent facsimiles is so exclusively given up to minor details, such as well-known photographic processes and materials. A compact, comprehensive statement on the manuscript itself, such as has been developed for precisely this use from Montfaucon to Gregory, would surely not have been out of place.

Another fault, to which new investigators of old manuscripts are prone, and which Mr. Sanders has not entirely escaped, is a tendency to overestimate their find and to prop this up by somewhat hazardous hypotheses, considered too certain and often too tenaciously clung to. Mr. Sanders' theory of the provenance of the manuscripts is growing momentarily more complicated. He now needs "some more out-of-the-way monastery" for the preservation of the manuscripts between the destruction of his favorite Monastery of the Vinedresser and 1906. Yet his theory to him "seems sure," and the much simpler and rather more probable hypothesis of Carl Schmidt and others seems to him "discredited" upon very insufficient grounds. The interpretation of the use of poorer parchment in © than in B or N to help establish for © an age as great or greater than the others seems rather like an inversion of the

² *The Old Testament Manuscripts in the Freer Collection*. Part I, "The Washington Manuscript of Deuteronomy and Joshua." By Henry A. Sanders (University of Michigan Studies; Humanistic Series, Vol. VIII). New York: Macmillan, 1910. v+104 pages, 3 facsimiles. \$1.

meaning of this paleographical evidence. When people began to use parchment for their most sacred book, the Bible, this meant that parchment was therewith recognized as superior material to anything else for this purpose and that they would search for the best of this material. As to Professor Goodspeed, so to the eye of the present writer, Θ seems paleographically nearer to the later Homer palimpsest (Brit. Mus. Add. 17210) than to the Berlin P. 6794 or Codex Ephraemi. Too great certainty seems to be shown by the editor of Θ in regard to the precise beginning, also, of the once complete manuscript and in the assumption of an apparently immediate papyrus ancestor. The introductory quire, which Mr. Sanders assumes was lacking, would in many, perhaps in most cases, not be numbered with the rest. The weakest section in the book, as has been amply demonstrated by Professor Goodspeed, is that on "Lection Marks." In the discussion of the text problem, Mr. Sanders has shown much care and praiseworthy diligence in the collection of much material. In the sifting of Θ , however, for Hexaplaric readings, the strands of the sieve seem too closely drawn for other manuscripts and rather too loosely for Θ . That the text of Θ is good, nearly or quite as good as A, B, F, etc., Mr. Sanders has proven beyond much doubt, yet the times are past when the "original Septuagint," or, still more, "the original Hebrew" could be too easily and too frequently deduced from one single manuscript. Minor matters are the misprints נֶאֱמַרִים and נֶאֱמַרִית for נֶאֱמַר, and the assumption that the modern "Ain Yâlô" near Jerusalem was identical with the Ajalon of Josh. 10:12. The collation is good, but, perhaps, not quite so absolute, as one might demand of a collation made at home. A rapid re-examination has shown the following errors: Deut. 4:6, the facsimile shows ποιησ|ται for Mr. Sanders' ποιησεται; 4:47, κατα pro κατ' is omitted; 7:15, επαξει pro επιθησει; 8:14, before δουλειας insert εξαγαγος pro εξαγοντος; 8:15, after εξαγαγος the σοι seems corrected from σε or vice versa; 9:11, δια add ante τεσσερακοντα; 12:2, after υποκατω + παντος insert δασεως pro δασεος; 12:11, it might have been well on account of the punctuation to print in full the manuscript's reading επικληθ|ηναι εκει το ονομα | αυτου· εκει οισεται; 16:12, after Αιγυπτω add πθ|ησεις pro ποιησεις; 18:20, προφητης should be προφητης; 18:22, εκεινος should be εκεινος; και² om | μη² + δε should read μηδε pro και μη²; 19:14, ην pro η²; 22:8, after οικειαν insert ποιησης pro ποιησεις; 24:17, και μνησθηση really belongs, as in Swete, to vs. 18; 27:2, before δυο insert λαβητε pro διαβητε; 27:15, before τεχνιτου insert ο add ante ανθρωπος; 27:26, after ος insert του add ante ποιησαι; 28:63, υμας¹ + | και πληθιναι υμας; 31:8,

before *σε* insert *ανησι* pro *ανησει*; 31:29, *επ|σχατων* pro *εσχατον*²; 32:8, should read *ους* pro *ως*; Josh. 1:15, before the *εν|τω* insert *ημιν* pro *υμιν*; 7:17, *και προσηχθη*² om; 8:7, *πορευεσθαι* should be *πορευσεσθαι*; 10:39, after *αυτη*² om insert *τη χεβρων* pro *την χ.*; 10:41, the first "ante"; 15:3, *πορευθησεται* pro *εκπορευεται*²; 16:8, *αυτου* pro *αυτων*¹; 17:1, before *Βασαντιδι* insert *Γαλαδιτιδι*; 18:4, before *ηλθον* insert *εμου* pro *μου*; 18:16, *και* add ante *καταβησεται*³; 20:7, *οριω* pro *ορει*¹; 21:44, before *ουδεις* insert *αντεστη* pro *ανεστη*; 22:5, *ποιειν*² om; 22:17, before *ου* insert *υμιν* pro *ημιν*; 23:16, should be spaced *και απολεισθε το ταχος*; 24:7, before *ιδον* insert *επ* add ante *αυτους*²; 24:12, *εξεβαλεν* pro *εξαπεστειλεν*². A few points which are less clear may further be mentioned. Deut. 19:1, *δε|αφανιση* seems from the facsimile to be corrected from *δι|αφανιση* rather than from *δη αφ.* The *τον* of 19:4 seems corrected from *την*. In 19:17 the *των* before *ιερεων* seems to be a correction; from what? 22:6, the second *ω* of *ωω* is a correction, from M (?) or N (?). Josh. 15:21 had perhaps better read *πρωτη* pro *προς τη* rather than *πω* pro *προς*. It is doubtful whether the *καριαθ' βααλ'*, Josh. 18:14, 15, deserves mention as a variant at all; there is no space between the two sections of the word as Mr. Sanders' spacing seems to indicate; and if the hook deserves mention in one place then why not in others, e.g., vss. 11, *ωσηφ'*—et al? The capitalization is inconsistent, often doubtful, and it might have been better in a collation to have omitted it altogether; if *Λευιτης*, as frequently, is begun with a capital, why not *βασαν*, Deut. 29:7, and *αρνων*, Josh. 7:24? What guarantee have we that *οζαν* pro *οζαν*, Josh. 6:26, stands for *Οαζαν*, and not for *ο Αζαν*? Another inconsistency is to be found in the designation of words or letters lacking entirely, of illegible portions, and of erasures, etc. Mr. Sanders does not use the usual symbols, nor has he a consistent system of his own.

All in all, Mr. Sanders' work displays much conscientious labor and many more good points than it is possible to mention here. As to the faults, here pointed out, they are natural and, in a measure, condonable, such as, with growing experience in the work, should disappear.

M. SPRENGLING

CHICAGO, ILL.